Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member has thrown considerable light which will not solve the problem. If the rules have been framed and if they become part of the Act, the question of amendment does not come in. Does the Government propose to amend the Act? Next Question.

Post of Assistant Advocate-General

*Q.—113. Sri ANDANAIAH (Kunigal).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) since how many years the post of Assistant Advocate-General is vacant in the High Court of Mysore ;

(*b*) the reasons for keeping the post vacant ?

A.—Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—

(*a*) Since 18th September 1963.

(*b*) In view of the number of High Court Government Pleaders being increased from six as on 17th September 1963 to nine, on 2nd June 1964, Government have not considered it necessary to fill up the post of Assistant Advocate-General.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಂದಾನಯ್ಯ.—ತಾವು (ಬ) ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಪ್ಲೀಡರುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು 6 ರಿಂದ 9 ಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದ್ದೀವೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ ಜನರಲ್‌ರವರ ಹುದ್ದೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮಗೆ ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಏನಾದರೂ ವರದಿ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ ?

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ.—ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವರದಿ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಂದಾನಯ್ಯ.—ಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಡವೇ ಅನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—They are not to decide. The Government decides whether half a dozen pleaders are necessary or not.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—In view of the enormous increase in the work, is it not desirable to fill up the vacancies ?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—The number of pleaders have increased from six to nine just to meet the increase in the workload.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಂದಾನಯ್ಯ.—ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ ಜನರಲ್ ಅವರ ಹುದ್ದೆಯ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಹುದ್ದೆಯನ್ನು ರದ್ದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ಅಥವಾ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ.—ನದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a matter of convenience for distribution of work and co-ordination.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—May I know when the Government appoints the Advocate General or Assistant Advocate General, what is the quantum of workload taken into consideration ?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—The quantum of work is judged by the work available in the High Court. In consideration of it we appoint Advocate General and when more pleaders are necessary we will appoint.

Shahabad Stone Quarries.

*Q.—125. Sri J. P. SARWESH (Serum).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the number of applications for lease of Shahabad Stone Quarries, that are pending consideration before the State Government;

(*b*) the names of the Shahabad Stone Companies that have applied for lease in Gulbarga District along with the dates of applications;

(*c*) the steps the Government have taken to convince the Government of India, that the sanction of lease of Shahabad Stone Quarries in Gulbarga District would not affect the contemplated Cement Companies ?

A.—Sri K. MALLAPPA (Minister for Industries and Commerce).—

(*a*) 50 applications. Out of 50 applications pending, 16 applications are for grant of Mining Lease for Limestone (Shahabad Stone) under Mineral Concession Rules 1960, and the remaining 34 are for quarry leases under Minor Mineral Rules, 1954, of erstwhile Hyderabad State.

(*b*) *Vide* detailed statements placed on the Table of the House. *

(*c*) All possible steps or being taken.

Sri J. P. SARWESH.—May I know the reason for the prolonged delay in giving license ?

† Sri K. MALLAPPA.—It is due to the fact that the Government of India are prohibiting leasing out of limestone mines to private people. They wanted reservation to be made for the purpose of steel industry.

Sri J. P. SARWESH.—Is it a fact that the Government have decided to grant lease for other applicants ?

Sri K. MALLAPPA.—There are two classes of applications. One class is regular mining for a long period and another for quarrying purposes. Quarrying is permitted. In November 1965 we have taken a decision to permit quarrying.

Sri J. P. SARWESH.—May I know the names of applicants who got sanction for fresh quarries for this year ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is all found in the list placed before the House.

Sri K. MALLAPPA.—These are the applications pending. I have already explained that on account of the ban imposed by the Government of India we were not able to give leases. We have taken a decision in November 1965 to permit quarrying.

---

*Copy placed in the Mysore Legislature Secretariat Library (No. 3, dated 31-1-1966.)